

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the specification to replace the somewhat indefinite term "module" with a better definition of the word "baustin", which is --component-- or --components--. As you can see from the Abstract of the Disclosure, the word is translated as --component-- and applicant has made such revision consistent throughout the specification and claims. Further, applicant has attempted to insert some grammatical changes to make the specification flow a bit better.

Regarding the amendment to the claims, applicant has changed the term "modules" to --components-- and further has clarified claim 18 to remove the alternative language.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the refusal to allow claims 1-9, 15, 17-18 and 20-21 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Gabor, and further the rejection of claims 10, 11 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Gabor in further view of Dubin.

Gabor teaches an optical system composed of lenticules wherein the optical system in its basic form consists of two systems of cylindrical lenticules in two planes parallel to one another. In each of the planes the cylindrical lenticules form regular arrays, parallel to the same direction. As can be seen from Fig. 1, the transparent sheet 1 is embossed on both sides with cylindrical impressions 2 (convex) and 3 (concave) forming the lenticules of the optical system. It is clear that the cylindrical axes of both the convex cylindrical impressions 2 on the front side and the concave cylindrical expressions 3 on the rear side are parallel to each other. It is obvious that the cylindrical axes of the convex cylindrical impressions 2 on the front side are parallel to the cylindrical axes of the concave cylindrical expressions 3 on the rear side, too.

According to the Examiner, the embodiment shown in Fig. 7 of the U.S. Patent No. 2,351,034 is considered to be novelty destroying for the subject matter of the present invention.

The optical system disclosed in Fig. 7 is composed of a first transparent sheet 9 having first cylindrical impressions (convex) on the front side and second cylindrical impressions (concave) on the rear side and a second transparent sheet 10 having first cylindrical impressions (convex) on the front side and second cylindrical impressions (concave) on the rear side. Again, the cylindrical lenticules of each transparent sheet 9, 10 form regular arrays, parallel to the same direction, in each of the planes. Since the cylindrical arrays form regular arrays on the front and the rear side of each transparent sheet 9, 10, there is clearly no offset in at least one direction.

Therefore and in contrast to the subject matter of claim 1 of the present invention, the beam forming device disclosed by Gabor is not assembled from at least two optically functional modules wherein each of the at least two optically functional modules has at least one first cylinder lens means on the first optically functional interface and at least one second cylinder lens means on

the second optically functional interface which is opposite to the first at least one second cylinder lens means with a cylinder axis which is aligned essentially perpendicular to the cylinder axis of the first cylinder means which is located on the first interface.

As described above, the embodiment shown in Fig. 7 is formed by a first transparent sheet 9 and a second transparent sheet 10, wherein each transparent sheet is formed like the transparent sheet which is shown in Fig. 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 2,351,034. This means that the cylinder axes of the cylindrical impressions 2 on the front side of each transparent sheet 9, 10 are parallel and therefore obviously not perpendicular to the cylinder axes of the cylindrical impressions 3 on the rear side of each transparent sheet 9, 10.

Furthermore, the present invention provides an offset of the lens means in one direction as shown in Fig. 4 and described on page 8 of the specification. Fig. 4 of the present invention shows the facet-like, offset arrangement of the second (the translation "two" instead of "second" is obviously wrong) cylinder lens means 21 on the second interface of the beam forming device. Gabor does not teach any offset arrangement of lens means since the lenticules form regular arrays.

In view of the significant difference in the teaching of Gabor, the use of same as a base reference for both an anticipation and obviousness claim is unwarranted.

If any questions remain, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

3/11/2009

Date



Stewart L. Gitler
Reg. No. 31,256

March 11, 2009

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC
2461 South Clark Street, Suite 522
Arlington, VA 22202
703.415.0100
Customer No. 20741

Attorney's Docket: A-9835.ROA/cat